Dr. A. R. Menon.—All right, Sir.

President.— So, Mr. Raja's name may also be included. Who seconds the motion?

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.—I second it.

Question proposed: "*That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.*"

Question put and agreed to.

President.—Will you accept, Mr. Kochunni Menon, if I appoint you as the Chairman of the Committee?

Mr. V. K. Kochunni Menon.—I shall accept it.

President.—Mr. V. K. Kochunni Menon shall be the Chairman of the Select Committee.

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—The Committee may be requested to report on this Bill within a period of 6 months.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.—I beg to second it.

Question proposed:—"*That the report of the Select Committee be presented to the House within 6 months from this date.*"

Question put and agreed to.

The Cochin Cow Protection Bill.

President.—Mr. Ramachandra Ayyar will move to introduce the Cochin Cow Protection Bill.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Sir, I beg to move that the Cochin Cow Protection Bill be read in Council.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—I second it.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Let me begin with the memorable words of Mahatma Ghandhi that the "*the cow is a poem of pity*". This is also confirmed by Dr. A. A. Macdonnel "*that to no other animal has mankind owed so much and the debt richly repaid with a veneration unknown in other lands. So important a factor has the cow proved in Indian life and thought.*"

At the coronation of the Hindu kings of old, it is said that an oath to protect the Brahmin and the cow was usually taken. The former part of the oath being beyond the purview of the Bill, I shall confine my observations on the sanctity of the cow from religious as well as economic points of view.

The history of cow protection in India is one of the brilliant phases of our national strivings. The cow occupied a prominent place in the mind of the sons of Bharata Varsha ever since the Aryans set their foot on the Indian soil. Not merely the Aryans of India but the members of the Aryan stock who will be found disbursed in foreign lands, specially the Indo-Aryans, have an exemplary veneration towards bovine cattle. In the *Rigveda* it is said "*the principle means of subsistence was cattle keeping*". Repeatedly in the Hymns we meet with prayers for whole-herds of cows especially milch cows "*which*

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

are the sum of all good which Indra has created for our enjoyment". According to *Sukra Niti* the cow is included among the components of an ideal household. In the Hymns of the *Adharva Veda* the Aryan votary invokes Vayu, Brihaspati and the whole band of beneficent supernaturals to keep their flocks together and safely conduct them home from the pastures. In one of the Hymns of the *Rigveda* it is said "*Right here come, ye cows and prosper here like the saka birds and right here do ye beget. May you be in accord with Goa. Attach yourself, oh, cows, to me as your posseessor. May this stable here cause you to prosper. Upon you, growing humorous and living, may we, increasing in wealth, alive attend!*". In Hymn, chapter 6, *sloka* 70, Arundhati is invoked to empty the horn of plenty upon the Aryan stables and protect the cows when on the pastures.

Besides these positive invocations, the *Adharva Veda* contains many passages wherein cow killing is deprecated as the most heinous of crimes. Hymn V. 18 of the *Adharva Veda* is a standing condemnation of any encroachment on the life of the cow. According to *Mahabharata* "*all that kill, eat and permit the slaughter of cows rot in hell for as many years as there are hairs on the body of the cow slain.*" According to *Artha Sastra*, Book 3, Ch. 29, capital punishment was inflicted on those who either steal, hurt or kill a cow or abet others to do so. Dr. John Morrison in his '*New ideas in India during the 19th century*' page 116 describes this feeling of the Aryans thus:— "*To kill a cow is as bad as to kill many men, for, suppose a cow has a life-time of 14 or 15 years. Her calves, say 6 cow calves and 6 bull calves. The milk of the cow and her 6 cow calves during their natural life-time could give food for a day to an army of 15,440 men, while the labour of the other 6 calves as oxen would give a full meal to an army of 2,56,300 men.*" Even though we may not be in a position to accept literally this rationalisation, we can readily decern the element of truth contained in it that to deplete the country of bovine cattle would mean the sure starvation of our sons in a greater or lesser degree. The cow is regarded in India as *a Matha*, a mother, and thus the *Gomatha* receives the unremitting love and veneration of the generality of the Hindu population. In the *Vishnu Purana* it is said that "*cows are auspicious purifiers and upon the cows depend the world.*" A house is purified by scouring it with a broom and plastering it with cow dung. "*Land is cle ansed by plastering it with cow dung and by sprinkling, by scraping, by burning or by letting cows pass a day and a night on it.*" In the *Vishnu Sutra* it is said that in the urine of the cows dwells the Ganges, prosperity dwells in the dust rising from their couch,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

good fortune in cow dung, and virtue in saluting them. Cows are the daughters of heavenly *Surabhi* created by Prajapati from his breath. Sri Krishna, the incarnation of Vishnu, was freely associating with herdsmen and the great Lord spent his childhood among cows and *gopies*. It is familiar that the bull is sacred to Siva, the God of destruction in the Hindu Trinity. Consecrating bulls and letting them loose is an age-long practice which we even now find in our temples. In the course of an article to the *London Times* on pre-historic India, Sir John Marshall, Director-General of Archæology, with the Government of India, observes "*of those recovered by Mr. Dkship last season the most striking perhaps is one depicting a Brahmini Bull the drawing of which shows great breadth and fine sense of the decorative. Incidentally it may be remarked this seal also proved that the breed of the Brahmini Bulls was every wit as good 5000 years ago as it is to-day.*" Sir Monier Williams, in his *Brahminism and Hinduism*, summarises the super-attitude of the Hindus towards the cows thus: "*In the forefront must be placed the worship of the cow and the bull. The utility of the cow, a source of nourishment, to a people who never kill animals for food and of the ox aud bull to the agriculturists who have no cart-horses for draught is manifest. The cow is of all animals the most sacred. Every part of its body is inhabited by some deity or other. Every hair on its body is inviolable. All its excreta are hallowed. Not a paticle is to be thrown away as impure. On the contrary the water it ejects is to be preserved as the best of holy waters. While nothing purifies like the cow dung. The filthiest place plastered with it once is cleanced and free from pollution while the ashes produced by burning this hallowed substance are of such a holy nature that they not only make all material things, however much unclean , but have only to be sprinkled over a sinner to convert him to a saint. As to the bull, he is dedicated to Siva and constantly associated with God as typical of generative power. Images of him are to be found in all Linga temples. The letting loose of a bull stamped with Siva's pendant in cities like Benares and Gaya is fraught with the highest merit.*"

Again slaughter of cows was reprehensible to Buddhists and Jains. The teachings of Buddha were instrumental in stamping out to a large extent the resort taken to sacrifice in Brahminical India. In the dialogues of Buddha it is ordained "*who-so-ever there be in the king's realm who devote themselves to keeping cattle and the farm, to them let the king give food and corn.*" The cows always appealed most to the Buddhists and there were special superintendents appointed in the early Buddhist times

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

As a prominent feature of the Buddhist attitude, the institution of the pinjrapole may be mentioned. In Zoroastrianism also cattle occupied a prominent part. The Sikhs stand out as the prominent protagonists in the cause of cow protection.

It remains to be seen whether the religion of the Prophet Mohammed, peace be on Him, has anything to say for the preservation of the bovine species on earth. Has the Quran, as the average Mohammadan would lose no time in asserting, any categorical injunction to the effect that the cows must be offered at the Bakrid and other festivals? Prophet Mohammed declared in Quran: "*And God has not ordained any Bahira, nor Sibah nor Wasilaz nor Hami, but those who misbelieve invent a lie against God for most of them do not understand.*" These are the names given to certain animals which are marked and allowed to graze at liberty. According to the Quran, Prophet Mohammed declares: "*Oh Ye who believe kill not game while you are on pilgrimage. Lawful for you is the game of the sea and to eat thereof, a provision for you and for travellers, but forbidden you is the game of the land while you are on pilgrimage*". This brings out forcibly the explicit nature of the declarations of the Prophet about the law on cattle life being taken especially on occasions of pilgrimage to the Kabha. Even though slaughter of animals was resorted to in Arabia in the valley of Mina in commemoration of Abraham's intended sacrifice, in accordance with divine concern we do not find a single instance where cow was offered in sacrifice or was required to be offered in sacrifice. We may search in vain the whole of the Quran for a passage mentioning the cow in name even. True, the second Chapter of the Quran is named after the cow, but it is simply to exhort the faithful against unbelief and apostacy. But for this we do not find another reference on the cow in the whole of the Quran. Recognised Moslim Molvies and political savants recognise this fact. Hakin Ajmalkan in his presidential address to the All-India Moslem League at Amritsar in 1919 says: "*We are and should be fully cognisant of the fact that cow-killing seriously annoys our country-men. But, before holding out any assurance to them, we must first see in what light our religion views this question. We must also determine the extent to which Qurbani is enjoined upon us irrespective, of course, of the slaughter of cows. According to Islam, Qurbani or sacrificial offering is only sunnat-i-muvakidah (a practice observed by the Prophet and emphatically enjoined on his followers) which Mussalmans as Mussalmans, as long as they can afford it, must observe. Now, it is a matter of choice to fulfil this observance by sacrificing*

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

camels, sheep, goat or cow which simply means that any of these animals can be fit offerings. Crores of Indian Muslims must be strangers to the slaughter of camels for the fulfilment of this observance, but none of them can possibly be accused of the slightest religious omissions. On the contrary, Muslims of Arabia, Syria, Egypt, Tripoli and Asiatic Turkey have been faithful to this observance without ever having slaughtered a cow..... According to another tradition, our Prophet said that of all sacrificial animals sheep was preferable; if we reserve sheep alone for the offering, we will be complying with this tradition".

Mr. Savel Zimmend, one of the prominent American visitors and sympathisers of India, discloses the same confessions of Hakim Ajmalkan. According to Mr. Zimmend, Hakim Sahib is declared to have said: "*Bakrid is the religious festival in which Muslims perform their religious pilgrimages around these holy places in Mecca. At this festival they have to sacrifice in pursuance of the sacrifice of Abraham. But neither the text of the Quran nor tradition enjoined the slaughter of a cow. In Turkey, Egypt, Syria and Persia, where a cow might be slaughtered without offence to any one, a sheep is preferred. Simply because the goat and the sheep are much more expensive in India than the cow, the Muslims prefer the latter*". These two extracts practically conclude this that neither Quran nor Arabic tradition has anything to say about the fundamental importance of cow slaughter in Islam on sacrificial occasions. History points out to the fact that the practice of the slaughter of cows in India is traceable only to the times following the Arab conquest of Sind in the early decades of the 8th century. The positive attitude of Islam and of Muslim tradition towards cow life is remarkable. According to Islam Gorbhshan, a brochure written by the late Syd Nazr Ahamed Sahib, Vakil, Sittapur, U.P., the Prophet is said to have declared to his wife Ayasha "*Cow's milk is the chief cause of recovery and health, ghee is a medicine and beef is a disease. Cow's milk is the means to cure diseases. Butter is the medicine, flesh is the disease*". According to another tradition of Islam, the earth is believed to be resting on one of the horns of a cow which makes us Hindus remind the place of *Kamadhenu* in Hindu mythology. Ali, the son-in-law of the Prophet, and Ghouse Azam, one of the prominent saints of Islam, never touched beef, during their life time, owing to their respect for life of the cow.

The Muslim monarchs of India were actuated by feelings of good will and sympathy towards the veneration of the cowby other Hindu subjects. Babar in

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

his advice to his son Humayoon exhorts him to protect the cow from slaughter. Akbar's firman regarding the protection of cow life shows his farsightedness in endeavouring to bring out economic and social equilibrium in the realm. Francois Bernier in his *Tracts in the Mogul Empire* informs us that even Jahangir and Arangaseeb were favourable in the preservation of the cow. Even the Amir of Afghanistan prohibited cow slaughter in his dominions in the year 1923. Mohammed Ali, in his presidential address at the Indian National Congress held at Cocanada in 1923 advises the Indian Muslims in the following terms:—

"*The only sure way of stopping cow killing in this case is to take steps to lower the price of mutton which is prohibitively high, and thus reduce the very large margin that there is at present between the prices of mutton and beef. I am far from desiring that the cost of living should be still further increased for any section of this impoverished land, not excluding my own community, which is admittedly one of the poorest, but I cannot but point out that by far the most numerous owners of cows are the Hindus, and that, if they did not sell cows after they ceased to give milk, there would be much less cow killing than there is to-day. Even now, we can encourage sheep breeding in order to save the cow ... . Nevertheless, I appeal to my co-religionists, even to-day, to discontinue the use of beef and not to wait until Swaraj is won when their sacrifice would be much less. The joint family system of India, and not the free competition of the Manchester School, must be our social and political ideal for India's different communities. But, if there is to be competition between the different communities that form the Indian joint family, let it be a competition in forbearance, self-scarifice, and I maintain that the community that willingly surrenders more of its cherished rights and strongly entertained sentiments for the sake of sister communites and the peace and harmony of India will prove the most invincible in the end*". Prominent Muslim patriots like Hakim Ajmal Khan, Maulana Abdul Bari and Mian Chotani have prevented cow slaughter and preached about cow protection.

Thus I have transgressed over the religious ground, and it is evident that almost all the great religions of the world-Hinduism Buddhism, Sikhism, &c., advocate the protection of cows and the religion of Muhammed is in no way opposed to it.

Further, the benefits of humanitarianism ought to be showered upon the animal kingdom, since, unlike human sufferers, they are not capable of speaking out their grievances and claim for charity. The animal having cause of pain must groan silently within itself and bear its wretched lot. On the other hand

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

unlike a suffering animal, man can make himself heard, and importunate his fellow human being to commisseration. The fine truths of religion, every religion, embrace the wholesome attitude to God's creatures upon earth.

The supreme ideal of a man is the creed of vegetarianism. Sydney H. Beard says: "*The harm done to man's moral nature directly by the consumption of flesh and blood is suggestive of the indirectly evil which results from the barbarous practice. It is undeniable that, where slaughter and bloodshed are most prevalent people become brutalised and crime increases. From the point of view of dietetics flesh-eating is not at all desirable for man. The horrors suffered by animals by the process of slaughter are unbearable.*"

The excellent qualities of cow's milk are so obvious on the surface that no recommendation of their uses in cases of debility and convalescence seems to be necessary. The superiority of cow's milk over even human milk is pronounced. In human milk and cow's milk proteids are respectively 2·00 and 4·00 fat 3·55 and 3·90 sugar milk 6·20 and 4·02 salts, 2·50 and 0·73 and water 85·75 and 86·20. The ghee is always useful in several ways, nutritive and medicinal.

Abbe Dubois writes that, "*to purify the body from any interior defilement that it may have been contracted there is no more efficacious way than by the performance of the Panchagavyam. Cow's urine is used both internally and externally. It is prescribed in colic and other diseases. Cow's urine is used externally in purifying metals*".

John Lockwood Kipling says about cow dung thus: "*The rustic pharamay of most countries knows the value of the substance as poultice, but in India the sanctity of the cow lends a semi-sacred sanction to its use, and its application has the prestige as well as the mechanical attraction of a cataplasm*". Cow dung is used invariably in plastering the walls and floors of Indian homes.

Professor Symmers of Belfast and Kirk of Ulster, after conducting a series of experiments have reached the following conclusions with regard to the utility of the urea of cows. "*From our laboratory and clinical tests we conclude that urea as antiseptic acts in the presence of blood.*

2. *That it is innocuous to animal tissues.*

3. *That in the quantities that can be used in wounds it is non-toxic.*

4. *That by its use at least half the labour necessitated by other methods of treatment is saved.*

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

5. That during its use the processes of repair are not at all retarded.

6. We believe that the most striking results will be obtained by its use as a first aid and dressing.

7. It prevents suppuration arising in wounds from chronic blood infections.

Urea is used as a diuretic in advanced heat failure".

The efforts at cow protection that were made successively throughout the general trend of Indian History may be examined. Marco Polo, the Venetian Traveller, emphasises the veneration of the Hindu towards the ox in those days of excessive national ordeal and dishonour under the severe yoke of the aggressive Muhammadans who were notorious for their hatred of the Hindu beliefs in the sanctity of cow life. Abbe Dubois, travelling in India towards the close of the seventeenth century, writes that "*to eat flesh of a cow is an ineffaceable defilement. The bare idea of tasting it would be abhorrent to any Hindu*".

Legislation in India towards protecting the cow life has a memorable historty of its own. Not only Hindu sovereigns but Muhammadan Emperors of India have striven their best for the cause of cow protection. Even when compared with social legislation of Manu wherein he declares cow killing to be a *upapathaka* and the Hindu Law according to Vasishta which inflicts penance upon the perpetrators of cow slaughter and allied legislation, the attitude and strivings in general of the State in India have a very favourable comparison. Pillar Edict V of Asoka is a lasting testimony towards prevention of cruelty to bulls especially during the process of castration. According to Kautilya "*cattle in calf, a bull, or a milch cow shall not be slaughtered. He who tortures them to death or slaughters shall be fined 50 panas*". Hieun, Tsiang informs us that "*Harshavardhana prohibited the taking of life under severe penalties and cause the use of animal food to cease throughout the five Indies*". Kalhama, in his *Rajatarangani*, mentions that Gopaditya, a Kashmir King of the sixth century A. D. "*did not tolerate the killing of cows*". In Bhandarkar commemoration volume it is stated that Akbar issued a firman prohibiting under penalty of capital punishment animal slaughter in general and cow slaughter in particular. This firman is preserved on the walls of a porch to the Adiswara temple on the Satrunjaya Hills close to Patiala State in the Kathiawad. Jahangir and Shade han confirmed Akbar's firman. According to Islam Gorakshana later Moghul sovereigns of India, such as Muhammad Shah and Shah Alam prohibited cow slaughter. Sivaji tried his best to prevent slaughter of cows. When the British exchanged their trade for the sword, the mere suspicion, alleged or actual, tha

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the fat of the cow was used in preparing cartridges for the Enfield Rifle ,drove into fury the Hindu sepoys in the British service and set up ablaze all the fires of the Hindus at the time of the Sepoy Mutiny. In Kashmir though predominantly Muhammadan, *Ranvir Danda Vidhi* provides:—

"*Section 219. Slaughter or murder of a cow or like animal. If any person intentionally kills or slaughters any animal of kine division, either the cow or bull, will be subjected to punishment. Either of the two kinds of imprisonments the terms of which may be up to 10 years, can be inflicted and a fine will also be imposed according to circumstances.*

Explanation:—The word 'cow' includes Gonda or wild cow also.

If any person keeps the flesh of any animal, referred to Section 219, in his possession knowing it or having reasons to believe that it is of any such animal, he will be punished. Either of the two kinds of imprisonments, the terms of which may be up to one year and a fine up to Rs. 500 will also be imposed according to circumstances.

Procedure.—The offence under this section is interferable by Police, unbailable and uncompounaable and will be tried by a first class Magistrate".

Likewise in the case of Nepal. As Sir. Bampfylde Fuller puts it "*Cow killing is under its strictest interdict among the Mongolian people of Nepal.*" In the State of Jhodpur there is a longstanding order prohibiting the slaughter of cows. Even the export of cows is prohibited. The Maharajah of Sandur State in the Bellary District declared in 1926 at Devanagore that the slaughter of cows shall be foabidden in the State and that old and dry animals in the hands of itinerant butchers, if they happen to pass through his territory, would be liberated at the cost of the State. Even Provincial Governments of British India are seen to be sympathetic towards the prevention of cow slaughter. Order No. 1236—955 of the Central Provinces Government, dated 31st May 1922, prohibited the killing of cows in the licensed as well as private slaughter houses situated within their jurisdiction.

In India various societies and leagues have been formed through the length and breadth of the country for the protection of cows, such as the Central Cow Protection Society under the patronage of Mahatma Gandhi with its head-quarters at Sabarmathi, the Islamic Goraksha Office at Seethapur, United Provinces, the Cow Protection League, Calcutta, under the presidency

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

of the late Sir Asutosh Mukerjee, the Humanitarian Association of Poona, &c.

Cochin is an agricultural country. Agriculture and cattle live or fall together. Each one is indispensable to the other. Without cattle there can be no agriculture and without agriculture there can be no live-stock. To promote agriculture the first thing that is essential is labour power. The chief animal agency which is within the easy reach of the ordinary labourer is the ox and the ox is the mainstay of agriculture. The paddy produced in the State at present is just sufficient for 5 months' consumption. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary to develop agriculture, and in order to develop agriculture we have to develop the breeds of the bull and prevent them from the clutches of the butchers.

In Cochin there is a consciousness prevalent throughout the country that the slaughter of cows is heinous and is undesirable, and we find that in markets the salesmen will promptly tell that the beef for sale is brought from the neighbouring British parts and that no slaughter was done in the State. The present Bill is only to legalise this public consciousness by giving it a legislative shape. For all these reasons, I move that this motion be carried. If, from the discussion, it is found the objection is to the details of the Bill, I am prepared to move for a Select Committee, so that it may, if necessary, incorporate all the provisions of Kashmir legislation on the subject, a copy of which was not available while notice of this Bill was given.

With these few words, I beg to move for the introduction of the Bill.

The House rose for lunch at 2—5 p. m. and met again at 3—p. m. with the Deputy President in the Chair.

Deputy President.—Is Mr. Ramachandra Aiyar's Bill opposed by anybody?

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—I beg to oppose the Bill. To my mind, the Bill seems to be a very curious one. Of course the living cow is certainly a very useful animal and we agree with the mover of the Bill to that extent. Nobody, therefore, disputes that point of view. Indeed the cow is a very useful animal. There are other aspects, however, of the question, which make me unable to support the Bill. These other features of the question are of course known to all, and by permitting the slaughter of the cow alone would that be possible. If I bring in a Bill to ligislate that the growing of brinjals is a penal offence, would it not look curious? On the same ground and for the same reason I oppose the Bill. I do not want to make a long speech.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Dr. E. A. Veigas.—Sir, I oppose this Bill. In the preamble to this Bill it is said that this is a Hindu State, and in a Hindu State like Cochin cows which are regarded with veneration by the Hindus should be protected from slaughter. In other words, it is tantamount to this. We, the Hindus of this Hindu State, are very religious; if any of you should, by your act, wound the religious susceptibilities of the Hindus, your liberty will be curtailed by legislation. This is very clear, Sir, and transparent to every one. Resolutions are brought forward in this House by, and for, the Depressed Classes with the object of taking away the disabilities and injustices created by Hindu religious system. In this case, an orthodox Brahmin introduces a Bill here with the object of asserting their ascendency. Mill, in his essay on 'Liberty' says, "*a great portion of the morality of the country emanates from its class interests and class superiority, the likings and dislikings of this powerful portion of society are the main things that practically determine the rules laid down for general observance under penalty of law*". This is very applicable in this case. This Bill ought to have taken root in this State about the 17th or 18th century but not in the 20th century when political leaders and social reformers are trying their best to remove certain socio-religious matters to bring all the people of different castes and creeds in India into one national unit. After all, the caste-Hindus, who are essentially vegetarians, are only about 15 per cent of the population, if I am not mistaken. More than half the population partakes of a mixed diet. The Brahmins do not live in close proximity with other classes and communities in the State.

Deputy President.—Caste—Hindus are not all vegetarians.

Dr. E. A. Veigas.—Most of them are essentially vegetarians.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—Said to be vegetarians.

Dr. E. A. Veigas.—They partake of a mixed diet.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—The Brahmins take secretly.

Dr. E. A. Veigas.—They can't discriminate between the taste of beef and mutton when they are given to them. More than half the population of the State partakes of a mixed diet. If this Bill is brought into force in this State, it will necessitate importation of flesh from outside and that will be a menace to the health of the State. That is from a medical point of view. The flesh of animals suffering from inflammatory, infectious and parasitic diseases should not be sold in the public market except after close scrutiny by the medical or health officers deputed for that purpose. If this Bill is passed, another greater crime will be

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

brought into existence in the State. It is cattle lifting. That crime will increase. The Superintendent of Police will be able to inform whether cattle lifting is taking place.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—My cow was taken away.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—Taken away?

Mr. A. B. Salem.—Yes, and the Police were not able to catch.

Dr. E. A. Veigas.—I hope the House will not pass this Bill because it will affect the economic condition of most of the people here and tend to lower the standard of their diet.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Sir, there are some conditions supporting this measure and what those conditions are I shall enumerate before I sit down. This House should remember that there is no question in India which agitates the public mind as this question does. There is no question which is capable of creating social distemper and communal animosities as this question of this unfortunate, wretched cow.

Mr. S. S. Koder.—Holy cow.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—I said wretched in the sense that cows are butchered. This cow question has done immense damage to the national progress, to the communal harmony, and especially in Northern India there is no question which is responsible for causing so much bloodshed as this question of cow. Such being the case, this question must be approached very cautiously and it should not be made a communal question in this House. If it is not to be made a communal question, there must be a spirit of give-and-take on the part of both sides. Those who are against cow slaughter must recognise the rights of those who demand their rights and those who advocate the slaughter of cow must realise that as far as possible they must try to meet the view points of the other side. If it should be possible that we should bring this question to a solution with a spirit of tolerance, then alone this question could be solved. This question may be viewed from various standpoints—from the sentimental and religious. It is an open secret that the Hindus, rightly or wrongly, place the cow on a higher level than any other animal, than any other four-footed animal. It may be sentiment, it may be religion. If it is sentiment, it is very difficult to defend this principle saying that the Hindus should not forbid the slaughter of the cow for eating. If it is sentiment, that sentiment must be operative in the case of all animals; but so far as the Hindus are concerned, I have seen, while they attach immense importance to this cow question, they don't feel the same sentiment towards other animals. Then what is it? If it is humanity, that humanity must be extended to the other

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

animals, sheep and goats, for there is no animal more innocent than the gentle sheep itself. Then it is a question of religion. It is treated as a question of religion, that it outrages the sentiment of Hindus, that the cows should not be slaughtered. To save that sentiment is not the duty of the Hindus, it must be the duty of the other communities, as far as possible consistent with their immediate requirements to do all that they possibly can, so that they may say we have done all that we possibly can do. It is with that spirit of helpfulness to render some service, to render all that can possibly be done to help the Hindus to protect their religious feeling, that this question must be approached by the other communities in this House. Sir, if anybody asks why you consider that sacrifice of cow is sacrilegious, it is very difficult to say. Nobody can assign a reason for sentiment. It is based upon no reason or logic. People believe. Why do they believe? Because they believe, that is all we can say. So far as the Hindus are concerned, this is a question of religion and not exactly of humanity alone. If it is a question of humanity, you will see the Hindus ill-treating the cow as any other community itself. I have one instance. I know of a Mohammadan gentleman whose business was to feed his cow with his own hands and he used to treat it as his own child. It is a moving sight to see the old man demanding to see the cow on the sick bed every morning, afternoon and evening and feeding it with his own hands. And the same man may kill a cow. Thus you see a man who does not eat beef is not disposed towards these animals or at least is not more favourably disposed towards these animals as the man who eats the beef. You will see the communities that eat beef treat their bulls and goats, if not better, as well as a Hindu does. Thus again the question reduces itself only to vague religious ideas and I may not for a moment say that religious sentiment, religious feeling should not be respected. In respect to that feeling, it is also essential that we should appreciate, we should realise the rights of other communities in this matter. If we realise that, I have no doubt the other communities will render all possible help to reduce, if not to do away with, this slaughter to a very great extent. When we are asking this question, we should not be guided only by the religious and the sentimental side. We must consider the economic side. There are certain races living in Africa where it is customary if a man gets too old, and he is unfit to earn his own living, when he becomes a burden on the community to destroy him. That is to go too far, no doubt. But that principle of selection, that principle of rejection, is absurd to a very great extent by the law of nature or of man in getting rid of the useless and rejuvenating the others. What will take

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

place if you do not destroy the cow? That is the question. Now, the pastural lands are reduced, year by year, by taking up cultivation and the law of Economics demands that the demand must be met as far as possible by the supply. If the supply is reduced, the demand cannot be met. The limited quantity of food and fodder that would be distributed among the selected few will have to be distributed among a larger section and the result will be that there will be deterioration of the whole bovine species from the economic point of view. Further, it should be clearly borne in mind that, by simply enacting this law in one part of India, this sacrilege or whatever you call it cannot be stopped. In one year in the whole of the Indian Empire the number of cattle is 3 lakhs fifty thousand of which ten thousand are being made use of. Mind, only ten thousand. Nearly one and odd lakhs are consumed by the army and the rest consumed by the civil population. Also there is a very large export trade to Burma from Bengal. A large amount of meat is sent direct to Burma and there is a large trade in hide and in bones. Strictly speaking this is a question, in a way economic question, and it must be viewed from this point. Is there not any measure? Can we not do anything to ameliorate the condition of these poor animals? There are various conditions in which we could help, we could render great help, we could render our economic condition better and we could meet the demands of those who want to eat. It will be the duty of this House to consider all these measures instead of summarily rejecting this measure because the mover has gone to the extent that no cow should be slaughtered. If the House is not agreeable, if the House thinks this is an extreme step, send this to a Select Committee and consider what measures could be adopted so that, as far as possible, the demands of all could be met. There is no doubt that a large number of cows and bulls are unnecessarily destroyed, and the Member for Anglo-Indians just now referred that the meat supplied in the market is not invariably sound. You know, nobody knows the rules whether a man is allowed to kill a cow or not. The law is silent and the result has been in all Municipal Councils no license is taken by the beef vendors, and when they are caught hold of, in Trichur they say they got it from the border side of the British. I know, as a matter of fact, the field where they butcher, and the result is that wretched, useless, worthless cows are slaughtered. Because we have no definite law and any fellow can get hold of any wretched animal and give its flesh to the men, it will be the duty of this House to regulate this and see that licenses are taken, as far as meat trade is concerned. Sir, I want this, House to know that if they don't realise this, they may safely leave the cow alone. The bull will supply as much

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

as the cow. I think even in European countries they don't sacrifice the cow. They only kill the bull.

Mr. C. Barton Wright.—Castrated animals.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—It will be a great sin from an economic point of view.

Mr. I. Raman Menon.—Cows also are slaughtered.

Mr. C. Barton Wright.—Do they ? They don't.

Mr. I. Raman Menon.—Cows are slaughtered at the end of four or five months.

Mr. C. Barton Wright.—Castrated animals are slaughtered. You may know better. That is my impression. You have been in England and you may have a better impression.

Mr. I. Raman Menon.—How is beef produced in England ?

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Whatever it might be, I know. I once saw a herd of this animal and the majority of them were bulls. But that is a line of action which the House may choose. This House may enact that no cow should be slaughtered while leaving the bull. That is another way in which this question can be tackled. Do you know what they do in Bombay? As soon as the milking period is over, the cow is sent to a butcher's shop as a profitably way of disposing to avoid the trouble of keeping it for one year, so that it might be used again for milking purposes. You can enact that no cow, during destitution period, should be slaughtered, and if this House without objection comes to the conclusion that cows should not be slaughtered, I think it a beneficial measure. What I want to say is that I want this House to realise that this question should not be viewed with any animosity. Let it be viewed as it would be viewed if we substitute goat instead of cow. If you do that, and if you are satisfied that reasons are given to this House that this question must be viewed more closely than summarily dismissing or sometimes calling brinjals or ladies' finger, then in that case, I say, this House will come to the conclusion that this must go to the committee stage. When it goes to the committee stage, let the representatives of all sections go to the committee and draft out a Bill which will be acceptable to the majority of the House and the majority of the people. The mere fact that some people have got the majority will not solve the question, because the Council is not perpetual, every three years there will be change. If, because we have a majority, we object to everything, right or wrong, then the same thing will take place in future on another occasion in a different manner. These then are the lines on which this House should proceed, and if you cannot meet the demands of the Bill presented, do not

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

do it. See what are the adverse conditions, in what way a Bill can be presented to the moderate section of the people and then also by making changes how to save the life of the bovine species. When all is said and done, the animal is useful from various points of view and it is the duty of the House to approach the question from a spirit of sympathy also for the feelings of those who feel acutely. There are those who, for instance, feel acutely on this question and it will be the duty of the Members to appreciate that fact and approach this question from this point of view also, and I do not plead for the people because man is a peculiar animal. As soon as he finds that an animal is useless, he generally extinguishes it. The horse is fast disappearing, and if it turns out that bulls are of no use, if it could not be sacrificed, could not be slaughtered, then the result will be these species will be extinct. Another point also. In destroying bulls you are not destroying the bovine species to the same extent as in the case of cows, because the bull is a polygamous animal and we can have any number and, therefore, the destruction of the bull will not affect so adversely as it would do in the case of cows. These then are the points that I want to place before you and I hope and I press all Members of this House will approach this question in this spirit to see whether we can do anything to ameliorate the social and economic condition. Let this question be not an apple of discord as was pointed out yesterday. I hope you will approach this question in a spirit of sympathy.

Mr. C. Barton Wright.—I endorse the view of the Member for Trichur.

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—I rise to oppose the Bill as it stands. I oppose on the ground of principle. While the mover was discussing about this Bill, I was thinking of a line of poetry that there is nothing good or bad in this world but thinking makes it so. I thought, when he was discussing the feelings of the Hindu community, that it would be affected by pollution. It cannot be so with regard to other people's standpoints. I do not intend to outrage the feelings of any community. I say it is inherent in the nature of man. The idea of worship is inherent in man and by that reason several sets of people have resorted to several things of nature, as a substitute for divine worship, and that may be the reason why the Hindu religion has held this animal as sacred in their estimation. So also the feelings of a community, which may be sound in one opinion, may not be so in the opinion of others. What one section of the population thinks to be a sin may not probably be considered so by other people. In this respect and considering it

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

from the political stand-point, the Hon'ble Member was just now saying that it is a bone of contention in the political world, in the British parts and it should be removed from our locality. I beg to state that our State has not to experience such difficulties and politically also I do not find any objection in desiring protection of cows, wholly. The Hon'ble Member was also speaking from the economic stand-point that, by slaughter, by killing cows, the country will be reduced to a poor state. He was referring to the agricultural side in our State, that, by reduction of cows by slaughtering, our economic welfare will be impoverished. But to that argument my suggestion is that, if cows which are not useful to the community are destroyed, we will get good species by the adoption of the principle of the survival of the fittest. It would be better to get rid of all superannuated cows or the barren cows or weak cows from their fold so that we can expect good species. I do not want to suggest here that, by destruction of this cow, meat should be provided for the population. I only suggest that the removal of cows like this will only better the conditions of the cows. Another stand-point, with which we have to look at this Bill, is economic. This cow's flesh or meat has been practically the staple food for people who do not feel an aversion. To get rid of that chance will be to enhance the price of it, and it would be dangerous to introduce a legislation like this. But, as the Hon'ble Member suggested, it would be worthwhile to consider this Bill from the stand-point of utility. If we consider certain cows which are not useful to those who bread them, if we consider that they are in a wretched state, it would be better to allow them to be slaughtered so that we may use them as food. But where we think they are useful, it would be better to preserve them and bring in a legislation that licenses should be obtained before cows or bulls are slaughtered. I only oppose this Bill as it stands because any destruction of cows is forbidden by the scope of the legislation. I only say that certain changes should be introduced in the Bill so that it may be applicable to all communities so that we may respect the feelings of other communities which venerate the animal.

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—Has the Member any objection to leave it to the Select Committee?

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—No.

മിസ്റ്റർ ഔസേപ്പ് പി. കണ്ടുകുളം.—ഈ ബിൽ ആദ്യം എന്റെ കയ്യിൽകിട്ടിയത് മുണ്ടകകൃഷിയിലെ നെല്ല് അധികം വളന്നിരിക്കുന്ന കാലത്തായിരുന്നു. അപ്പോഴാ ഇതു വായിക്കുമ്പോൾ കാട്ടുപന്നിക്കും കയറാതെ സൂക്ഷിക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള ഒരു ബില്ലാണെന്നാണ് ഞാൻ വിചാരിച്ചതു. (ചിരി.) എന്നാൽ വായിച്ചുനോ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ക്കയെപ്പോലെ അതല്ല. പശുക്കളിൽതന്നെ നല്ലപശുക്കളും—അതു കിഴവൻ കിടക്കമേൽകിടന്നു കൈകൊണ്ടു തടവുന്ന പശുവിനെപ്പോലെയുള്ള നല്ല പശുക്കളും—ചീത്തപ്പശുക്കളും ഉണ്ടു. ഈ കാട്ടുപശുക്കളേയും രക്ഷിക്കേണമെന്ന നിബ്ബന്ധത്തോടുകൂടി കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ള ഈ നിയമത്തെയാണു് ഞാൻ വിരോധിക്കുന്നതു്. ഈ തരം ഒരു ഉപയോഗവുമില്ലാത്ത പശുവിനെ രക്ഷിക്കേണമെന്നുള്ള നിബ്ബന്ധത്തോടുകൂടി കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ള ഈബില്ലിനെ പിന്താങ്ങുന്നതു ശരിയല്ല. ഈതരം പശുക്കൾ പെറ്റാൽ പാലില്ല. കൂടികൾ വലുതായാൽ കൃഷിക്കും ഉതകുന്നതല്ല. നല്ലഫലം തരുന്നപശുക്കൾക്കു തിന്നുന്നതിനുള്ള പുല്ലെല്ലാം പകൽതിനു നശിപ്പിക്കും. മനുഷ്യർക്കു ഉപജീവിക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള നെല്ലെല്ലാം രാത്രിയും തിന്നുതീർക്കും. ഇവ ഹൈജീനിക്കു നിയമം നോക്കിയാൽ ഇവയുടെ മാംസം ദേഹത്തിനു വളരെ രക്ഷചെയ്യും. എക്കോണമിക്കു നിയമം നോക്കിയാൽ ഇവയുടെ ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാർക്കും ലോകം ഒട്ടാകക്കും നഷ്ടംവരുത്തികൂട്ടുന്നു. ഈ മാന്യമെമ്പരാണു് ഇതുകൊണ്ടുവന്നതെന്നുള്ള കാരണംകൊണ്ടും; പശുവെന്നത ഹിന്തുക്കളുടെ മതാചാരപ്രകാരം പൂജിച്ചുപോരുന്ന ഒരു ജീവജന്തുവെന്നുള്ള ഏകകാരണംകൊണ്ടും പിന്താങ്ങുന്നതു ഒരിക്കലും യുക്തമല്ല. നാലുമുള്ള പശുക്കളുടെ കൂട്ടത്തെ കൊന്നോട്ടെ, തിന്നോട്ടെ, എന്നാക്കിവെയ്ക്കുകയാണു് വേണ്ടത എന്നാണു് എനിക്കു പറവാനുള്ളതു്. പിന്നെ പശുക്കൾ ഇന്നസെൻറാണെന്നു പറയുന്നു. അവയുടെ ബുദ്ധി അത്രചൊവ്വുള്ളതൊന്നുമല്ല (ചിരി): വല്ല സാധുക്കളുടെയും ചീത്ത വേലിയുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ പത്തൊമുപ്പതൊ പശുക്കളൊരുമിച്ചു ചെന്നു ഒന്നിന്നൊന്നു പിന്നിലായിനിന്നു ശക്തിയുള്ള പശു സാമർത്ഥ്യത്തോടുകൂടി വേലികുത്തിപ്പൊളിച്ചു, എല്ലാംകൂടിയകത്തുകടക്കുന്നു. അവയുടെ ബുദ്ധി അത്ര നല്ലതാണെങ്കിൽ ഈവക വലിയ കളവുകൾ അവമനസ്സിലാക്കാൻ തരമില്ലല്ലൊ. ആടു, എരുമ മുതലായവയുടെ കായ്ത്തലാണെങ്കിൽ പശുക്കളെപ്പോലെയുള്ള നല്ലഫലങ്ങൾ ധാരാളം കിട്ടും. അത്ര ദോഷങ്ങളുമില്ല. അവയെയാണു് കൊല്ലാതിരിക്കേണ്ടതു. അതും ഒരു ജീവജാലങ്ങളേയും കൊല്ലരുത എന്നു ഒരു നിയമം പാസ്സാക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അതിനെ പിന്താങ്ങുന്നതിനു ഞാൻ ഒന്നാമനായിരിക്കും. എന്നാൽ ഇവിടെ ഇന്നസെൻസിനെ അടിസ്ഥാനമായിരിക്കുന്നു. അങ്ങിപ്പോട്ടത്തു മാത്രമല്ല നിയമം കൊണ്ടുവന്നിരിക്കുന്നതു്. അങ്ങിനെയാണെങ്കിൽ മാടപ്രാക്കളേയും ഉൾപ്പെടുത്തേണ്ടതല്ലെ? ഇനിയൊന്നുള്ളതു് ഹൈജീൻ ആണു്. പാലുകുടിച്ചാലൊ നെയ്യുകഴിച്ചാലൊ ദേഹത്തിനു രക്ഷയാണെങ്കിൽ മാംസവും അതുപോലെതന്നെയാണു്. എന്റെ വീട്ടിൽതന്നെ ചിലക്കു പല്ലുവേദന മുതലായ സുഖക്കേടുകൾ ഉണ്ടായിട്ടു ഞാൻ അനവധി പണം ചിലവിട്ടു. ഒരു ഫലവുമുണ്ടായില്ല. ഒടുവിൽ കേരളകൃഷ്ണാണ്ടി

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ദ്ധയിൽ ഗോമാംസരസംചേർത്തു അവരെ തേറ്റിച്ചു. ഇപ്പോൾ എല്ലാവർക്കും പൂർണ്ണസുഖമായിരിക്കുന്നു (ചിരി). ഇവിടെ ഗോവധം നിർത്തിയാൽ ഞാൻ ഈ എണ്ണക്കു എവിടെപോകും? പിന്നെ, ഹിന്ദുസ്റ്റോറാണെന്നുള്ള കായ്മാണ്. കൊള്ളാം. ഒരു ക്ഷത്രിയരാജാവ്; ഒരു ബ്രാഹ്മണമന്ത്രി; ഒരു ബ്രാഹ്മണ എക്സൈസ് സൂപ്രണ്ടെണ്ട് ഇങ്ങിനെ ഇരുന്നിട്ടും കള്ളുകുടിനിർത്തുവാനുള്ള മുറവിളി കേൾക്കാത്ത ഗവർമ്മെണ്ടാണൊ ഇപ്പോൾ ഇതു സമ്മതിക്കുവാൻ പോകുന്നത് (ചിരി); ആളുകളെ കള്ളുകുടിച്ചു ബസ്സുകളുടെ മുമ്പിൽ ചാടിവീഴുവാൻ അനുവദിക്കുന്നു; ഏറ്റവും ഉപദ്രവകരമായ കള്ളുകടിനിലനിർത്തിപ്പോരുന്നു. എങ്കിലും ഉപദ്രവമൃഗങ്ങളായ പശുക്കളെ കൊല്ലുവാൻ ഗവർമ്മെണ്ടിൽനിന്നു അനുവദിക്കേണ്ടതാണ്. റിലിജ്യസ് സെന്റിമെന്റ് എന്ന കിക്കിളിയാണു പിന്നെ പറയുന്നതു. എന്നാൽ സെന്റിമെന്റ് രണ്ടുകൂട്ടർക്കും ഉണ്ടു. പശുവിനെ കൊല്ലുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു ഒരു കൂട്ടർക്കു ഒരു സെന്റിമെന്റ് ഉണ്ടെങ്കിൽ മാംസാദികം ഭക്ഷിക്കുന്നവർക്കു ചില പ്രത്യേക ദിവസങ്ങളിൽ അതു കിട്ടാഞ്ഞാലും ഒരു സെന്റിമെന്റ് ഉണ്ടു (ചിരി). മാംസം ഭക്ഷിക്കാത്ത ചുരുക്കം ചിലരുടെ സെന്റിമേൻറിനുവേണ്ടി മാംസം ഭക്ഷിക്കുന്ന അധികം ജനങ്ങളുടെ സെന്റിമേൻറ് നശിപ്പിക്കണം എന്നാണ് ഈ ബിൽ പ്രകാരം വരുന്നതു്. ഞാൻ മേൽവിവരിച്ച പ്രകാരം ഒരുകൂട്ടം പശുക്കളെ നശിപ്പിക്കാതെ വർദ്ധിക്കുന്നതിനു സമ്മതിച്ചാൽ അന്യ രോഗികൾക്കും കൃഷിക്കാർക്കും നല്ല ഫലം തരുന്ന പശുക്കൾക്കും കൃഷിക്കു ഉപയോഗപ്രദമായ നല്ല കന്നുകാലികൾക്കും എക്കൊണമിക്കു രാസ്യം അനുസരിച്ചും ഫൈജീനിക്കു രാസ്യം അനുസരിച്ചും വളരെ വലിയ നഷ്ടം വരുത്തികൂട്ടുന്നവയാകുന്നു. അതിനാലാണ് ഞാൻ ഈ ബില്ലിനെ ബലമായി എതിർക്കുന്നതു്.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ.—ഈ ബില്ലിനെ എതിർക്കുമ്പോൾ ജീവകാരുണ്യബോധവും സെന്റിമെന്റും മറിപ്പെട്ടതാതെ സംസാരിക്കണം. ബിൽഅവതരിപ്പിച്ച മെമ്പരുടെ ജീവകാരുണ്യത്തെ ഞാൻ ബഹുമാനിക്കുന്നു. എന്നാൽ ജീവകാരുണ്യം മാത്രമല്ല മനുഷ്യർക്കുവേണ്ട ഗുണം. ജാതിവ്യത്യാസം മനുഷ്യരുടെ ഇടയിൽ ഇപ്പോൾ ധാരാളം ബുദ്ധിമുട്ടുകൾ ഉണ്ടാക്കിയിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതു ഇനിമൃഗങ്ങളുടെ ഇടയിൽകൂടി ഏർപ്പെടുത്തുന്നതു കഷ്ടമാണ്. പശുവിനെ കൊല്ലണമെന്നല്ല ഞാൻ പറയുന്നതു്. ഒരു ജീവിയേയും ആരും കൊല്ലരുതു്. പശുവിനെ മാത്രം കൊല്ലാതിരിക്കുന്നതു് ജീവകാരുണ്യം കൊണ്ടല്ല. ആരാധന ബുദ്ധികൊണ്ടു മാത്രമാകുന്നു. ആരാധന ബുദ്ധി അതിർത്തിയിൽ നിർത്താഞ്ഞാൽ അപകടകരമാണ്. ആരാധന ബുദ്ധിക്കു അടിമപ്പെട്ടു് മനുഷ്യർ ആലിനോടുകൂടി അനുഗ്രഹങ്ങൾ പ്രാർത്ഥിക്കുന്നു. പശു വളരെ ഉപകാരമുള്ള ഒരു ജന്തുവാണെന്നു സമ്മതിക്കാം. അതിന്റെ പാൽ, നെയ്യ്, ഇ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

റച്ചി—ഇതു ചിലപ്പോൾ മരുന്നിനും (ചിരി),- ഇതുകളെല്ലാം വള രെ ഉപയോഗമുള്ളതാണ്. എങ്കിലും നാം പശുവിനെ ആരാ ധിക്കുന്നതെന്തിനു? ആ ബുദ്ധിയെ നാം നിശ്ചയമായും തടയണം. മനുഷ്യനു മനുഷ്യൻ വലുതു്. മനുഷ്യനാഗരികത വലുതു്; ആ രാധനാബുദ്ധി നമ്മെ ചീത്തവഴിക്കു തിരിച്ചു നമ്മുടെ ഗുണങ്ങളെ തടയുന്നുവെങ്കിൽ നാം നിശ്ചയമായും അതിനെ എതിർക്കുകതന്നെ വേണം. പിന്നെ ഇതു ഹിന്തുമതകാര്യമെന്നു പറയുന്നുണ്ടു്. ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ ഹിന്തുക്കളുടെ കാര്യമായിരിക്കാം. പണ്ടത്തെ ഹിന്തുക്കൾക്കു പശുവധം പാടില്ലെന്നു നിർബ്ബന്ധമുണ്ടായിരുന്നില്ല. പുരാതന ഹിന്തുമത ഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങൾ എഴുതിയിട്ടുള്ളതു ഹിന്തുക്കൾ ഗോക്കളെ തിന്നിരുന്ന കാലത്താണു്.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Your authority?

മിസ്റ്റർ. കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ.—ഞാൻ ശ്ലോകം കാണാതെ അധികംപഠിച്ചിട്ടില്ല. ശ്രോത്രിയായ അഭ്യാഗതായ വത്സതരം മഹോക്ഷം വാ" എന്നിത്യാദി നോക്കുക. ഒരു ശ്രോത്രിയൻ വരുന്നുവെന്നാൽ ഒരു പെണ്ണാടിനേയൊ ഒരു മുട്ടൻ കാളയേയൊ കൊല്ലണം. പഴയ കാലങ്ങളിൽ യാഗം എന്നുപറയുന്നതു ഒരു ഫസ്റ്റ്ക്ലാസ്സ് ഡിന്നർ (ചിരി) ആയിരുന്നു. അതിനു പലതരത്തിലുള്ള മാംസങ്ങളും മദ്യങ്ങളും ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നു. ഇങ്ങിനെയിരിക്കെ നാം സെൻറിമേൻറിന്റെ പേരുംപറഞ്ഞു അതിനു അടിമയാകേണ്ടതില്ല. ഉത്തരരാമചരിതത്തിൽ ജനകമഹാരാജാവ് വാല്മീകിയുടെ ആശ്രമത്തിൽ ചെന്നപ്പോൾ 'ഇന്നുമാംസം വെയ്ക്കരുതു' എന്നു വാല്മീകി കല്പിക്കുന്നു. ഇതിൽനിന്നു രണ്ടു സംഗതികൾ തെളിയുന്നു. പണ്ടുമാംസം തിന്നുന്നവരും തിന്നാത്തവരും ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നുവെന്നും അതുകൊണ്ടു മതത്തിന്റെ പേർപറഞ്ഞു ശഠിച്ചിട്ടു കാര്യമൊന്നുമില്ല.

വേറെ ഒരുവാദം ധനശാസ്ത്രവശം നോക്കിയിട്ടാണ്. അതു പറഞ്ഞാൽ നില്ക്കില്ല. ഇവിടെ മാത്തമാറ്റിക്കൽ ഇക്കൊണൊമിക്സ്മാറ്റ് സെൻറിമേൻറൽ ഇക്കൊറണാമിക്സാണ ഇപ്പോൾ പറന്നിരിക്കുന്നതു്. പശുക്കളെ കൊന്നാൽ അവയുടെ വംശം നശിക്കുമെത്രെ. ആടുകളേയുംമറ്റുംകൊന്നിട്ടു ഇതുവരെ തിന്നീട്ടുണ്ടൊ? അവയെ ധാരാളം കൃഷിചെയ്യണം. ഹാളൻഡ് മുതലായ ദിക്കുകളിൽ പശുക്കളെ ധാരാളം കൊല്ലുന്നുണ്ടു്. അവിടെയാണ് അധികം വെണ്ണയും മറ്റും ഉണ്ടാകുന്നതും. അധികം പശുക്കളുള്ളതും. ട്രിവേന്ദ്രം മെമ്പർ പറഞ്ഞപോലെ ഉപയോഗമില്ലാതെ അവകളെ വെറുതെ നിത്തിയാലാണ് അവ നശിക്കുന്നതു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു ആ ധനവശത്തുനിന്നുകൊണ്ടു പറയുന്ന വാദം ശരിയല്ല. ഇതുയും പറഞ്ഞതുകൊണ്ടു പശുക്കളെ കൊല്ലേണമെന്ന പ്രസ്ഥാനത്തെ ഞാൻ സാധൂകരിക്കയാണെന്നു വിചാരിക്കരുതു്. നോർത്തിന്ത്യയിലെ വഴക്കമെന്നും ഇപ്പോൾ ഇവിടെ ഇല്ല. ഹിന്തു

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ക്കാം അനാവശ്യമായി ക്രസ്ത്യാനികളേയും മുഹമ്മദീയരേയുംകൊ പിഴുപ്പിക്കുവാൻ ഇവിടെ തുടങ്ങിയിട്ടില്ല. ക്രസ്ത്യാനികളും മുഹമ്മദീയരും ഹിന്ദുക്കളേയും അനാവശ്യമായി ഇവിടെ കൊചിപ്പിക്കുവാൻ തുടങ്ങിയിട്ടില്ല. ഈ അനർത്ഥങ്ങളൊന്നും ഇവിടെ ഉണ്ടാക്കിത്തീർക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യമൊന്നുമില്ല. പശുവിനോടുള്ള ജീവകാരുണ്യം അതിനെ വളർത്തുന്നതിലാണു കാണിക്കേണ്ടതു്. ഒരുസായ്പിന്റെ പശു തടിച്ചുരുണ്ടതു നന്നായിരിക്കും. ഒരു ഹിന്ദുവിന്റെ പശു എല്ലുംതോലുമായി ദയനീയമായിരിക്കും. ഇതാണു ഹിന്ദുക്കളുടെ ജീവകാരുണ്യം. ഗോമാംസം തിന്നുന്ന ഒരുവൻ പശുവിന്റെ വേദനകണ്ടാൽ സഹിക്കയില്ല. പശുവിനെ കൊന്നുകൂടെന്നുപറയുന്നവർ അതിന്റെ കറവ മാറിയാൽ അതിനെ ക്രസ്ത്യാനിക്കൊ മുഹമ്മദീയനൊ വില്ക്കുന്നു. ഇതാണു് വ്യത്യാസം. ഈ ബിൽ അവതരിപ്പിച്ച മെമ്പരുടെ മതഭക്തിയെ ഞാൻ ആക്ഷേപിക്കുന്നില്ല. അദ്ദേഹം ഈ ബിൽ പിൻവലിച്ചു, പൊതുവെ ജീവകാരുണ്യത്തിനുപററിയ ഒരു ബിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരേണമെന്നു ഞാൻ അപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു.

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—I rise to support the Bill, not because I am standing here as a Hindu and that I worship the cow as a sacred animal. I support this Bill simply because it appears to me that the protection of cows is an economic problem which affects not only the Hindus but every other community as well. (*Hear, hear.*) I do not want to utilise this Bill to play upon the sentiments of any particular community, be he a Hindu or a Muhammedan or a Christian. I want all of them to look at the question from an economic point of view and also from an agricultural point of view. All of us must realise that India is mainly an agricultural country. We in Cochin get paddy here which is our main article of food, and not beef. The paddy that is grown in this State is able to support us only for five months. We have to depend entirely upon the import of this article from other countries. Now, so long as agriculture is the main support of the people of land as also the whole of India and as also the whole of the world, I want to impress on you that the bovine species is the chief motive power to carry on agriculture and the instrument of agriculture, and you cannot cultivate the land without the help of the cow or the ox. So long as these two things are absolutely necessary to carry on your agricultural operations, it is your bounden duty to preserve that species from wanton slaughter. No doubt, the Hindu from his over-zealous religious point of view. might have given thiscolouring of religious sentiment to the question of cow-slaughter probably because the Aryan clearly realised that, in order to make the common

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

people understand the economic problem of this question or that the old Aryan probably thought, if it was coloured with a little bit of religious sentiment also, it will be bringing it more into the heart of the ordinary cultivator or the ordinary peasant than otherwise. You will be pleased to find that, so far as this question is concerned, I think the mover, no doubt, has, in support of his Bill, in moving this Bill for the consideration of this House, mainly drawn upon the arguments which I find given in an excellent book which has been written upon this subject by Mr. P. R. Sundararam M. A., Fellow of the Royal Economic Society, London. I would request each and every Member of this House, before he makes up his mind to oppose this Bill or veto it, to read this book carefully so that he may understand the various aspects from which this question has been looked at. Not only from the religious point of view, not only from the sentimental or humanitarian point of view, not only from the point of view of dietetics, not only from the point of view of agriculture but from all these points of view the whole question has been considered and every argument, in favour of and against it, is given and collected in this small book. (*A voice: Wholly in favour.*) Probably you have not read the whole of this book. So far as this question itself is concerned, he gives the history of it and no doubt, in fact, the main arguments or rather the consciousness of all the civilised community so far as all people are concerned seem to be in favour of it, not because there is any religious sanctity attached to it or mainly on account of that alone. But, you will find from the under-current of the whole thing that this is more a social problem, this is more an economic problem, this is more an agricultural problem. In considering this question, therefore, I once more submit to this House that it should not be carried away by mere sentiment alone. Now, I appeal especially to my Christian brethren in this House that it is very easy for them to consider this Bill in a very favourable aspect, because he is unlike the Muhammedan, the ignorant Muhammedan, so far as this question is concerned. I don't mean the learned people among the Muhammedans. So far as that community is concerned, all the civilised people have now begun to realise that there is no religious injunction in the Quran that during the time of the Bakrid the cow or calf has to be sacrificed. It is not at all necessary for the Muhammedans to obey the injunctions of the Quran to have these animals sacrificed. It is well-known now amongst all the Muhammedans. But there are still some ignorant folk among them who really think that, be-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

cause it is a religious obligation upon him, he is to kill a cow. There is no such difficulty so far as my Christian brethren are concerned. There is no religious sentiment like that in their religion. So far as preservation of life is concerned, so far as killing is concerned, I think that religion stands supreme now. So far as they are concerned, the only difficulty is they—the majority of them—are accustomed to eat beef, as an article, not exactly of food, but of curry. It is not their staple food; they have to live entirely upon rice. Now, to him I say, consider this matter from an economic point of view also. It is not beef alone that you are eating but you are eating several other kinds of flesh as well. It is very easy for you to give up this beef eating, and to take to other, if you are so very particular, kinds of meat which are available to you. As the Member for the South Ezhuvas said, if there was a Bill here prohibiting killing of all animals, he would have welcomed it. Let this be the first step. Probably a day of *Ahimsa Paramo Dharma* and all that may come. This may probably be the beginning. There may be other things coming forward, so that, simply because there is a Bill here for the protection of cows and prohibiting its slaughter, let him not think that it is *Aradhana* carried to extremes and all that.

Now, you will allow me to say that, so far as this question is concerned, this problem has, from the point of view in which I have tried to place it before you, been engrossing the attention of almost all communities, not only now, but from time immemorial. As one Hon'ble Member said, there was a time when the Aryans themselves thought that cow was a fit object of sacrifice. The Aryan, who venerated the cow as an animal of worship, even he, at one time thought that it was a fit object of sacrifice, but you will find, if you trace Aryan history itself, that that feeling actually diminished and he began to substitute one animal after another for the purpose of sacrifice, until we come to the elimination of the most useful animals so far as mankind is concerned. Even he who once thought that cow was a fit object of sacrifice gave up the sacrifice of animals absolutely. Probably *Grihya Sutra* and the passage from *Uttara Rama Charitha* were written at a time when there was this transition going on. It will be seen, if you trace the history of Aryan civilisation from beginning to end, as I submitted, there was no doubt a transition stage, i. e., when the Hindu himself thought that cow was a fit animal for slaughter and subsequently he gave it up, probably because he found out that the cow was an essential animal for his own existence and for increasing his own prosperity so that it will be a sin to waste that animal. That was the very reason why every other community, the Sikhs,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the Jains and the Parses and every other religion also looked upon this question not only from a religious point of view itself. So far as the doctrine of the Parsees is concerned, whereas the Hindu worships the cow and not the bull, it is quite exactly the opposite with the Parsee. They think that *Vrishabha* the bull is to be considered to be a very sacred animal and not the cow. If you trace the origin of it, if you try to understand the reason for it, you will find that it is mainly the economic point of view that is actually considered. No doubt there is a religious *kikli* also and a utilitarian point of view in favour of it to be considered. That is why the animal is sought to be preserved by all sorts of religious injunctions as also otherwise. If a religious injunction also is put in, we all know that, with a people who consider religion to be a supreme thing, itis easy for them to take it into their mind and obey it. Just take, for example, our practice of fasting. We all know that a Hindu has to fast on a particular day because it is *Ekadesi* or some other day of religious importance. The only principle probably is, fasting now and then is absolutely essential for you. But if you do not tell him that it is *Ekadesi* and so you must fast, probably he may not do it at all. That probably may be the reason which accounts for this fact that, so far as the cow itself is concerned, you must worship the animal, you must not kill it, because it was considered to be the most useful animal so far as the existence of the whole humanity itself is concerned. There cannot be any doubt as to its preservation of it, if you look at it from the utilitarian point of view or any other point of view. I am sure you have to admit that, of all the useful animals for the existence of the human being, the cow is the most useful; its milk, its ghee, its every other product is indispensable to man. Somebody was popooing the idea that the old Aryan probably was using its urine as an antiseptic. I want to inform you the opinion of the best medical officers on the point. They have now begun to realise that the cow's urine is a good medicine for consumption and the cow dung is used not only as poultice but as a disinfectant. As it is at present understood, the Hindu drinks cow's urine because he thinks it is a sacred thing and so it is used as an ingredient for *Panchagavyam*—but this thing would take away any kind of poison in the system. Now people have begun to realise—no doubt we were thinking that the orthodox Hindu was foolishly doing all this—that there is a scientific basis in all these things. We have begun to realise it now, especially when Western Scientists have gone into the question more fully and they have analysed and they tell you that these so-called Aryan fools also knew that scientific

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

principle. We are now foolish to think that they were foolish, superstitious and all that. Whatever that may be, what I want to place before this House is that this is more an agricultural problem, more an economic problem so far as we are concerned. The object of the Bill may be that the slaughter of either cows or bulls may be prohibited. As the Member for Trichur himself said, you should not view this question from that view-point alone. This is a question which has to be considered from a more serious aspect. You must try to come to some sort of satisfactory conclusion at least to restrict the killing of useful cows as also useful bulls, and for that purpose especially to shape this Bill itself into an acceptable form by having a Select Committee appointed to have this gone into in more detail. I want all of you to read this book to which I referred and which is in the Council library. This seems to be a very useful book. You must not look at it from a very narrow point of view alone, of eating beef, that it is the main article of food, and if that is to be taken away from us, the food problem will become more difficult and all that. You should not view it in that aspect. I do not want to say that you should not eat beef at all. Of course if you can avoid it, well and good. Modern tendency is also in favour of it. In that connection I want to say one thing An eminent Doctor says—I am only quoting from this book— '*from the point of view of dietetics flesh eating is not at all desirable for man.*" No doubt there may be that *kikli* that is referred to by the Member for Mulankunnathkavu. Sir Benchamin W. Richardson, M. A., F. R. C. S., says "*I sincerely hope that, before the close of the 19th century, not only slaughter houses will be abolished but the use of animal flesh as food will be absolutely abandoned*". That seems to be the opinion of eminent doctors, and we know, as a matter of fact, that the modern creed is vegetarianism and not eating meat. We must all try to do that. Now, it may not be possible for all people all at once to follow that. But this is only a small measure to bring that into gradual practice so that you must look at it only from that point of view also. Don't think that by enacting this law you are going to take away one article of staple food from a large section of the population of this country.

Now, I have been under the impression till now that there was a proclamation itself in the State clearly enforcing that slaughter of cows was an offence. In fact it was not I alone that was labouring under that impression. Many of my friends were also under the impression that there was such a proclamation. I have heard of a case where a conviction for slaughter of cows

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

was reversed either in appeal or in revision by the Chief Court for the reason that there is—I am told it is said there no—penalty prescribed by the enactment or the proclamation, whatever it be, though the slaughter of a cow was considered an offence. It is an offence, but no punishment can be given for it. That only shows that there is that consciousness, as it was remarked by the mover himself, throughout the population of this country that cows should not be slaughtered at all because it is considered to be an offence. I do not know whether that proclamation is still existing or forthcoming, but I know there was that consciousness and there is that consciousness even now, so much so that, people, if they want to kill cows, had to take it to Travancore territory or British Cochin. In Travancore I do not think there is any such law. That consciousness that at one time at least there was such a proclamation, whether it is still existing, whether it has been subsequently cancelled or not, is there. Anyhow that is another matter. What I want to say is that this is not the only country where such a legislation is proposed. Even in the small State of Sandur in the Bellary District in this Presidency itself there is a law that cow should not be slaughtered. Moreover, this is not a problem concerning Native States alone. Even in British Indian Provinces, for example, in the Province of Behar, there is an ordinance that cow should not be slaughtered even in slaughter houses. As the mover himself pointed out, in Cashmere and Nepal also there is such a legislation. I think you will be surprised to know the Amir of Afghanistan in the year 1923 passed a law prohibiting slaughter of cows in Afghanistan. So also in the Jodpur State, so that this is not a new thing which is being proposed to be legislated here. As the mover himself pointed out, we are only trying to translate into action by an enactment the consciousness of the people already existing. Of course, I really understand the difficulty with regard to this question, because, as it has been stated, a large part of the population have to eat beef and they are eating beef. No doubt we have to consider that aspect also and that is a question which will be carefully considered and which will have to be carefully considered by the Committee that may be formed to consider this Bill. We must try to evolve a Bill which is least offensive and which at the same time may be calculated to bring about substantially the protection that is intended by this Bill. I do not think it should be vetoed simply because my friend, the mover of the Bill, is only showing his supreme veneration for the religion that he observes or that he wants to gain some meritorious virtue by trying to bring forward this Bill.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

That seems to be the spirit with which some of the Members seem to consider this Bill. What I say is, you must consider the whole thing from a dispassionate point of view and try to see whether it is not an economic problem which we have to face. Whatever may be the Hindu-Muslim question in Northern India, fortunately for us, we are free from all those things and we must all, whether Hindu, Christian or Muslim, consider this from this point of view and we must come to some sort of understanding with regard to this matter. It is not a Bill which should be brushed aside as absolutely useless or absolutely controversial or absolutely communal. I once more pray that the Members of this House will not look at it from any of these points of view but will look at it from the particular standpoint of the agricultural and economic prosperity of the land.

മിസ്റ്റർ ഐ. ഇ. അമ്മൂക്കൻ.—ഈ ബില്ലിനെ ഞാനും എതിർക്കുന്നു. അതു് ഒരു പ്രത്യേക കാരണം കൊണ്ടാണു്. ഞാൻ ഒരു കുസ്ലൃാനി ആണെന്നു് വെച്ചിട്ടാണെന്നു് ആരും തെറ്റിദ്ധരിക്കരുതു്. സാധാരണ ഒരു നിയമം ഉണ്ടാക്കുമ്പോൾ അതിനതക്ക ആവശ്യമുണ്ടെന്നു് തീർച്ചപ്പെടാതെ അങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്യുന്നതു് യുക്തമായിരിക്കയില്ല. ഈ ബില്ലിന്റെ ഉദ്ദേശം പശുവിനെ സംരക്ഷിക്കുവാനാണെന്നുള്ളതു് വാസ്തവമാണെന്നു തോന്നുന്നില്ല. എന്തെന്നാൽ,പശുവിനെകൊല്ലാതിരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു് സംരക്ഷണ നടക്കുമൊ? കൊല്ലാത്ത ദിക്കുകളിൽ പശുക്കൾ വളരെ നന്നായി കാണുന്നില്ല. അവയെ വളർത്തുന്നതിലാണു് സംരക്ഷണ വേണ്ടതു്. പശുക്കളെ കൊല്ലാത്തവരുടെ നാടായ മലയാളത്തിലെ പശുക്കളാണു് തീരെ മോശം. പശുക്കളെ കൊല്ലാത്തവരുള്ള നാട്ടിൽ അവയെ കൊല്ലുന്നതുകൊണ്ടാണു് അവയുടെ സ്ഥിതി മോശമാകുന്നതെന്നു് പറയുന്നതു് തീരെ അബദ്ധമാണു്. എന്റെ ബോദ്ധ്യം അവയുടെ മോൾ സ്ഥിതിക്കു കാരണം അവയുടെ പട്ടണിയും കറവയും തന്നെയാണെന്നാണു്. ഇനി കൃഷി, ഇക്കോണമി, എന്നിങ്ങനെ പല കാരണങ്ങളും പറയാം. പക്ഷെ അവ യുക്തിക്കു ചേർന്നവയാണൊന്നാ ആവശ്യമുള്ളവയാണെന്നെ ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്കുന്നില്ല. പിന്നെ പ്രധാനമായി ഹിന്ദു രാജ്യം എന്നാണു് പറയുന്നതു്.

ഡെപ്യൂട്ടി പ്രസിഡെണ്ടു്.—അതു പറയേണ്ട കാര്യമില്ല.

മിസ്റ്റർഐ. ഇ. അമ്മൂക്കൻ.—പ്രിയാമ്പിളിൽ അതു പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു പറയാതെ തരമില്ല.

ഡെപ്യൂട്ടി പ്രസിഡെണ്ടു്.—ഏതു തരത്തിലും വേണ്ട.

മിസ്റ്റർ ഐ. ഇ. അമ്മൂക്കൻ.—പക്ഷേ ഈ ഹിന്ദു മനോഭാവം മറ്റുള്ളവരിൽ ജനിപ്പിക്കണം എന്നുള്ള വിചാരം ശരിയല്ല. അതു് ആദ്യം ഹിന്ദുക്കളിൽതന്നെയാണ ഉണ്ടാകേണ്ടതു്. എന്നാൽ ഏ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ല്ലാം നന്നു. അതെ ആവശ്യമുള്ളൂ. ബാക്കിയുള്ളവർ പശുവിനെ കൊല്ലുന്നതു് തെറ്റായി ഗണിക്കുന്നില്ല. അവരെ അതു് തെറ്റാണെന്നു് ഗണിപ്പിക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യവുമില്ല. അങ്ങിനെയുള്ള മതഭക്തി തീരെ തെറ്റാണു്. ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ പരിഷ്കൃതാവസ്ഥക്കു അതു വളരെ പോരായ്മ കൂടിയാണു്. വെള്ളാരപ്പിള്ള. മെമ്പർ പണ്ടൊരു പ്രൊക്ലമേഷൻ ഉണ്ടായിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നു് വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നു. പക്ഷെ അതിനെപ്പറ്റി നിശ്ചയമില്ല. ഏതുവിധത്തിലും അളുകൾ പശുക്കളെ കൊല്ലുകയും തിന്നുകയും ചെയ്തിരുന്ന എന്നുള്ളതു് വാസ്തവമാണു്. ഓരോന്നിന്റെയും തത്വമാലോചിച്ചാൽ ഏതു നിയമങ്ങളും വേണം? ഭരണിക്കാലത്തെ കോഴിവെട്ടിന്റെ ഒരൊറക്കഥ ഓർത്താൽ മതി. ആ സാധു ജന്തുക്കളെ കൊല്ലാതിരിപ്പാൻ ഒരു ബിൽ വരെ വേണം.

ഡെപ്യൂട്ടി പ്രസിഡെണ്ടു്.—അതൊക്കെ ഇതുപോലെതന്നെയാണു്.

മിസ്റ്റർ ഐ. ഇ. അന്ത്രുക്കൻ.—പലതിന്നും അപ്പോഴം ബാത് ആവശ്യമാകും. അതിന്നു് അത്ഥമില്ല. അതുകൊണ്ടു് അനാവശ്യമായിട്ടുള്ളതും മതസംബന്ധമായ വഴക്കുകൾക്കു കാരണമായിട്ടുള്ളതും ആയ ഈ ബില്ലിനെ ഞാൻ ബലമായി എതിർക്കുന്നു.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran —Sir, I wish to say a few words in this connection. It is rather unfortunate that the author of this Bill has framed this Bill in objectionably wide terms and has chosen to introduce it in a still more objectionable manner. Every one is, I am sure, prepared to concede that there is a certain economic fact underlying the rather universal and objectionably worded Bill before us. But when the mover starts by quoting texts and attempting to impose upon this House a sort of religious, historical or perhaps mythological sanction, I have to join issue with him.

I do not think the mover's conclusions are borne out by his premises. When the Aryans invaded India long long ago, say some 5 or 6 thousand years ago, they were pre-eminently a nomadic race. They used to go about with hoards of cattle and camp in open plains and on festive occasions they used to kill a bull or a fatted calf and feast over it. There is no doubt about that. That might have been the first stage. Then they came to India and came across the plains of India. They naturally thought of agriculture as lucrative. They settled down in batches and started agriculture. Having started agriculture, they found there was money in it and continued. It might be at that stage that they started thinking that some check must be introduced against slaughter of plough animals. Some able legislator at that time thought of introducing moral legislation to that

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

effect. It would be unsound, so immoral to slaughter cows or bulls. I find a large number of texts quoted on the floor of the House in favour of the Bill. I also find that there are a large number of texts contra. Though Members have quoted texts on either side for the purpose of this Bill, I am afraid that for the purpose of this Bill neither religious nor mythological sanction is necessary (*hear, hear*). It is also to be noted in this connection that oftentimes religious sanctions introduced were introduced merely to cover a much more mundane purpose, namely, economic efficiency. Coming now to the economic point, I am not ready to say that it is an unmitigated good to allow promiscuous slaughter of the bovine species. The Bill, however, as it is now presented, is, I am afraid, in such a crude form that one is rather disposed to object to the Bill than to support it. I would have no objection personally for supporting the Bill, if the provision, for instance, is only as regards milch cows. I would, on the other hand, very seriously oppose the perpetuation of barren cows and bulls, because it would be really uneconomic. What is the meaning of maintaining a lame bull? What would be the meaning of maintaining a cow which is declared to be barren or which has passed the age of bearing calves? I say all those questions have to be considered before we consent to such a wholesale proposition like this (*hear,hear*). If as a matter of fact,some workable proposition could be evolved out of it,I would have no objection. As the Bill now stands, I am sure that most of the Members will be compelled to oppose it. If some workable and acceptable *via media* could be evolved out of the tangle, I should be glad to support it.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—I really fail to see why several Members have traversed beyond the real issue. To me it appears that the Bill as presented is not any reactionary measure which ought to be summarily brushed aside. Nor is it such an uncontroversial piece of legislation which may be accepted, doing away with all the different stages which a Bill has to pass through. What I beg to place before the House is that the Bill ought to be sent to a Select Committee, as has been pointed out by the Hon'ble Member for Trichur. If it were a most mischievous piece of legislation or a most uncontroversial piece of legislation, then certainly a decision can be arrived at even now. But, from the views expressed by the Hon'ble Members who opposed this Bill, it has not been made clear that the Bill is reactionary in its nature. Therefore, my humble submission is that the Bill should be sent to a Select Committee stage. That will be the time when the various aspects of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

question could be properly and fairly discussed and the necessary things done to give a proper decision upon the point. Objection has been taken to the wording of the preamble, the person who brought the Bill and many other things of that sort. If the preamble is wrongly worded, of course the mover will not have any serious objection to change the preamble. I am, therefore, of opinion that the Bill may be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. V. V. Anantapadmanabha Ayyar.—I entirely endorse the views expressed by my predecessor, the Hon'ble Member for Vadakkancheri.

Mr. K. Mohamed Seethi.—Sir, I was hesitating to speak upon this Bill, because the Muslim has been identified to be the arch enemy of the cow. Any protection suggested to be given to the cow would unfortunately be misunderstood to be a thing that would be opposed by Muslims. As the Member representing the Muslim constituency, I had, therefore, my own fears in giving expression to my sentiments. So, I have been silently watching the discussion in this House and the points of view given expression to by the Hindu and other non-Muslim communities on this Bill. But I feel that it behoves on me to express myself on a topic which is of all-engrossing importance to Hindus as well as the Muslims not so much in Cochin as outside it. This question has led to fatal results in some places in India; but so far as our own State is concerned, there has been no tension between the above two communities owing to cow killing or music before mosques. I do not think that the communal aspect of this question is very serious as far as Cochin is concerned, since both these communities are pulling on very harmoniously in our State (*hear, hear*). The economic aspect of the question should naturally affect all communities inhabiting the State because economics is not the monopoly or the concern of a particular community. If the country were to advance economically, the benefits accruing from it will be shared by all communities inhabiting the country without distinction of caste or creed. With regard to the communal aspect also, I may at once say, in my individual capacity and as the representative of a large body of Muslims, that, when there comes into being the necessity for the Muslims to respect the sentiments of another community without detriment to their own religious susceptibilities, the Muslims will never be failing to do their duty. I myself am not a beef eater. I may also say that beef is not a favourite diet of the Muslims of the State. But Muslims have been slaughtering the cow or the bull for sacrificial purposes. They may think that this Bill is designed to take-away one of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

their privileges which they have been enjoying for a long time. This feeling only arises when it comes to forcing their hands and curtailing their liberties by legislation; then resentment sets in. The statement in the Objects and Reasons that the State is a Hindu State and that as such it should protect the cow is extremely ill-advised. In fact, legislation should not have been attempted for the protection of the cow. But all the same I would not oppose any measure in that direction if it does not interfere with the religious rights and liberties of the Muslims. With these remarks, I may say that the Bill may be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—I regret I have to speak on this subject. I very much desired not to speak or take part in this discussion but my silence may be misconstrued by my constituency. Personally, as a Theosophist, I hate to destroy the life of any animal. I would prefer not to eat meat at all personally. But my community and the communal constituency which I represent is a meat eating community and as such my silence here may be misconstrued by my constituency. I will also be failing in my duty, if I do not speak upon this which affects them also. Perhaps this is the only Bill so far which might affect them a little. I cannot see the necessity for this legislation. Because in this State, before the Legislative Council existed, before the bureaucracy arose, when it was absolutely under the personal rule of His Highness the Raja of Cochin, this slaughter of cows, although not welcome, although was abhorrent to the sentiments of the ruling family, yet for those classes here requiring that, some allowance or concession was made. They were allowed to kill it, not in Cochin soil but in the immediate neighbourhood and they were allowed to take the same to their homes. That was the state of affairs. At that time also this State was an absolute Hindu State and their Hindu ideas and the influence and incoming contact of others ideas were not then there at that time. This legislation or proclamation was not necessary. It is the consciousness of the Jews that no cow can be killed in Jew Town. They have to take it to British Cochin or Venduruthy if they wanted to kill cows. Now, Sir, the difficulty is this. It would have been much better for the mover not to press his motion. Because, here is a piece of legislation which he brings for protecting cows. I do not think that any people, whatever be their caste, creed or religion, would like to kill a milch cow or kill a cow with a child in it. Some Members say that they can kill cows which are quite useless. Nobody generally kills a milch cow. So I ask where is the protection? Now, under these circumstances, I do not

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

think it possible to effect any change. And then what is the other consideration? You are going to say that, because you have brought a Bill into the Legislative Council, we shall try for a compromise. What is the compromise? The compromise is that some say that you can kill cows which are not useful. The Hindu sentiments are that you cannot kill any sort of cow or bull. Now, if you are going to respect the Hindu sentiment, then you should respect it fully. But I say that you cannot respect the Hindu sentiments when there are so much of difference of opinion between the Members. Now, that is my difficulty. Therefore, from the economic aspect we should further think about this matter than from the humanitarian side, whatever may be the sentiments of the people. I cannot really see how a solution of the problem can be made except to rouse the humanitarian conscience of the people. If the people by themselves are prepared to discard the eating of beef altogether, it is well and good. My two children do not eat beef at all. Now, with regard to the appointment of a Select Committee, I can say for certain that, however clever, however eminent they may be, they will not be able to do anything in the matter. Therefore, I cannot see my way to support this motion though I sympathise very much with the mover of the same.

Deputy President.—The motion for the appointment of a Select Committee does not arise now.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Sir, I beg to move that the Bill be read in Council.

Question proposed: "*That the Cochin Cow Protection Bill be read in Council.*"

Question put and agreed to.

Secretary to the Council.—The title of the Bill is "the Cochin Cow Protection Bill".

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Sir, I beg to move for the appointment of a Select Committee to consider the Cochin Cow Protection Bill consisting of the following Members, *viz.*, Messrs. K. Mohamed Seethi, K. P. Kannan Nayar, C. Barton Wright and K. Ayyappan, Dr. A. R. Menon, Messrs. C. J. Mathew, C. A. Kunjunni Raja, and the mover.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I beg to second that.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—I beg to include the names of Messrs. A. B. Salem and P. C. Chanchan so that the Committee may be representative.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I second it.

Deputy President.—Who is to be the Government Member?

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—The Member in charge of the Department may be nominated and in this case the Govern-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ment Member is Mr. I. Raman Menon, Superintendent of Agriculture and Panchayats.

Question proposed: "*That a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. I. Raman Menon, K. Mohamed Seethi, K. P. Kannan Nayar, C. Barton Wright, K. Ayyappan, C. J. Mathew, A. B. Salem, P. C. Chanchan and C. A. Kunjunni Raja, Dr. A. R. Menon and the mover be appointed to consider the Cochin Cow Protection Bill.*"

Question put and agreed to.

Deputy President.—I nominate Mr. I. Raman Menon as the Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Sir, I beg to move that the report of the Select Committee be submitted within six months.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—I beg to second that.

Question proposed: "*That the report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the Cochin Cow Protection Bill be submitted within a period of six months.*"

Question put and agreed to.

The House rose for the day at 5 p. m.

T. K. KRISHNA MENON,
Secretary to the Council.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly